Revised 10/99

### I. INTRODUCTION

Idaho's State Board of Education (SBOE) has long recognized the importance of promoting short- and long-term research activities at its institutions of higher education because of the role that both play in the education of Idaho's citizens and the economic development of the entire state.

During the mid-1980's, Idaho sought a grant from the National Science Foundation's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) to improve the state's science, engineering, and education programs and to become more successful in acquiring external competitive funds, especially federal funds. Despite being awarded planning money, efforts of the advisory committee appointed by the SBOE to obtain EPSCoR funding were unsuccessful. National Science Foundation (NSF) peer review comments addressed several problem areas which, if corrected, would enable Idaho to reapply for EPSCoR funding.

Idaho's failure to obtain EPSCoR funding led to a significant number of events to promote academic research. The most valuable event was the Board's appointment of a statewide advisory committee on academic research to determine the most efficient mechanism to promote research activities at its four-year institutions. The Board charged the Committee with the task of developing specific recommendations for increasing the research efforts at those institutions and making the institutions more competitive at seeking external funding for research activities. After a ten-month study, the Academic Research Committee submitted its report and recommendations to the Board in April 1988. This report provided the foundation for the Board's initial Academic Research Policy.<sup>1</sup>

The ten years following the Board's first Academic Research Policy and the creation of the Higher Education Research Council (HERC) have seen a significant increase in the quality and quantity of research generated at the public institutions of higher learning in Idaho. Unfortunately, in 1998, the Legislature terminated funding for one of the HERC programs, the Specific Research Grant Program. The State Board of Education in turn restructured the membership of HERC, replacing campus representatives with the Presidents of the four-year college and universities. They charged the Council with modifying the Board's Policy on Academic Research. The revised policy is entitled the Higher Education Research Council Policy. It is more concise and reflective of the current climate of academic research in the state of Idaho. It addresses public awareness, accountability issues and the importance of economic development and commercial applicability in state funded projects.

The Higher Education Research Council has worked diligently to refine their charge, and to create an atmosphere whereby the State Board of Education, the Legislature and the citizens of Idaho can be assured of the best use of funds allocated for HERC sponsored research programs. It is the Council's position that the new atmosphere, Board policy, and changes to the program will attract projects that serve to strengthen the research capabilities in the state of Idaho.

Introduction – I

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For a more detailed history of the development of Idaho's initial Academic Research Policy, please see "Enhancement of Campus Academic Research in Idaho: A Statewide Policy Approach," by Robin A. Dodson, Gary Fay and Rayburn Barton. Copies will be made available through the Office of the State Board, on request.

Revised 11/98

### II. HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH COUNCIL POLICY

Section III - W of the Board's Governing Policies and Procedures Manual

1. Purpose and Coverage

The Higher Education Research Council Policy presents guidelines to Boise State University, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College and the University of Idaho on the most effective use of the limited resources of the State of Idaho, provided by the Legislature as a line item for research and overseen by the Higher Education Research Council, in promoting research activities that will have the greatest beneficial effect on the quality of education and the economy of the State. The implementation of this policy will be the duty and responsibility of the Board's Higher Education Research Council (HERC).

2. The Role of Research in Higher Education

Research is the creative search for and application of new knowledge.

a. Philosophical Statements and Guiding Principles

Public awareness of the significant role science, technology and other research play in our world has also been accompanied by an enhanced demand for the scrutiny of publicly funded research, accountability, and attention to the management of ethical, legal, and safety issues associated with academic research. A demonstrable return on the state's investment requires the development of a statewide strategic plan for science and technology that will assist in the identification of general research areas that will enhance the economy of Idaho via partnering between academia, industry and/or government. HERC will facilitate this partnering and interaction among business, industry and the public sector with science, engineering and other research faculty. To this end, HERC will be an active participant in the development, implementation and monitoring of the statewide strategic plan for science and technology.

This policy is designed to assist the public baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate institutions in addressing these areas via appropriate research activities through:

- individual and multi-disciplinary research projects;
- extensive and rapid dissemination of the new knowledge and establishment of knowledge networks which would facilitate public, private and academic institution interaction; and
- collaborative relationships between academia and varied shareholders outside the academy.

The guiding principles are:

(1) to maximize impact on the quality of education and economic development as a consequence of Idaho's investment in quality science, engineering and other research.

- (2) to ensure accountability for the state's investment via demonstrable results.
- b. Support of research activities with public funds is important because:
  - (1) Research is important in the education of students at all levels.

At the graduate level, students master current knowledge and produce new knowledge. The higher the quality of research and scholarly or creative activity in which the student is involved, the higher quality of his/her education. In addition, the education of undergraduates is enhanced through their participation in research.

(2) Research plays an important role in maintaining and enhancing faculty quality.

Active participation in research by faculty prevents obsolescence. The saying that "research informs instruction" is meritorious. Research ensures that faculty stay abreast of current developments in their field. While faculty currency and vitality is important at all three degree levels, it is absolutely essential for those educating graduate students.

Effective training of future researchers at our universities and colleges requires faculty who are dedicated to teaching. In addition, because of the rapid generation of new knowledge, departments must have active research programs in order to teach students the latest scientific innovations and in order for university investigators to seriously compete for local, industrial and federally sponsored grants.

(3) Academic research contributes to economic development.

Economic development interests are most directly served by attention to applied research which itself is based on the results of basic research. Academic institutions traditionally provide assistance in solving problems as well as in developing new knowledge. It is important that all academic institutions, particularly Ph.D. granting institutions, continue to serve these functions.

- c. The Board desires to increase the quality and quantity of research and to encourage continued public support of research in Idaho through application of the following principles:
  - (1) The quality and quantity of academic research produced is extremely dependent upon the research infrastructure.
  - (2) Faculty at Idaho's baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate institutions will be eligible to compete for research funds.
- d. The development and implementation of a statewide strategic plan for science and technology is a vehicle for identification of research objectives and areas.

#### 3. Specific funding programs to strengthen research in Idaho

The Board recognizes that talent exists on all of the campuses and the importance of permitting competition for research support and initiation funds. Therefore, the Board will use the following criteria in allocating funds for research activities under this policy at the various institutions.

Additionally, any condition set forth in the legislative appropriation for these research programs must be demonstrably met by the programs and/or projects that are to receive the appropriation.

#### a. Infrastructure

A portion of the competitive research funding should be distributed to the state's baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate institutions to support their science, engineering and other research infrastructure. Distribution of these funds will be made according to percentages approved by the Higher Education Research Council. These funds should be reserved for library support essential to research, graduate research assistantships, post-doctoral fellows, technician support, maintenance contracts, research equipment, competitively awarded summer research support, start up funds for new hires, and incentives to reward faculty for their research achievements.

### b. Specific Research Funding

Faculty members at the state's baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate institutions will have an opportunity to submit research project proposals for review under this program.

- (1) All projects under this program must demonstrate economic benefit or cost savings for the State.
- (2) A major focus under this program should be start up and seed funds that will assist a principal investigator in competing for external funding.
- (3) Collaborative research projects are encouraged.

Guidelines for this program will be established by the Higher Education Research Council, will incorporate an out-of-state peer review, and will include an evaluation component for commercial applicability for the benefit of the State.

#### c. Research Centers

Many important advances can only be made with the establishment of focused research centers. Centers typically involve at least three faculty members in conjunction with the necessary research equipment and support personnel. The funds needed to establish centers of this type are large and, in all probability, no more than one such center per year should be established in Idaho. Minimal state funding of \$250,000 per center per year for at least three years is essential to enable centers to become nationally competitive. This is clearly a

minimal amount which should be supplemented by non-state matching funds. Multiple year funding is essential for the establishment of these centers.

#### d. State Matching Awards

Under this program state funds would be available to match those awarded by non-state sources by using an external peer review process.

Examples of matching entities for the state matching funds would be:

- (1) Federal Agencies
- (2) EPSCoR projects e.g., National Science Foundation, National Institute of Health, Department of Energy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, etc.
- (3) Foundations e.g., Murdock, Northwest Area, Robert Wood Johnson Grants, etc.
- (4) Business and Industry
- (5) Other

#### e. Post-Award Accountability

Any project receiving funding through any of the previously described Board sponsored programs will be required to report on its productivity with respect to such items as:

- \$ number of students involved
- \$ number of faculty involved
- \$ external funding earned as a result
- \$ publications in refereed journals
- \$ presentations at professional meetings and conferences
- \$ patents awarded or pending
- \$ economic benefits
- \$ problem resolution

Reporting procedures will be established and administered through the Higher Education Research Council.

#### 4. State Research Council

In order to advise the Idaho State Board of Education on the implementation of the above strategies, an Idaho Higher Education Research Council, which reports to the Board through the Instruction, Research and Student Affairs Committee, shall be appointed by the Board. The assigned responsibilities of the Higher Education Research Council will include the following:

- (1) determine and distribute to all interested parties the guidelines for submission of proposals under the competitive programs.
- (2) organize the review procedures for proposals submitted under the guidelines mandated and recommend to the Board which of these proposals should be funded.

- (3) recommend ways in which cooperative inter-institutional graduate and research programs can be encouraged, developed, and sustained.
- (4) monitor the productivity of each funded project to warrant continued funding and to provide accountability.

The membership of this Council shall consist of representatives from each of the state's universities and the four-year college, representatives of the public committed to research, and the Statewide Science and Technology Advisor as appointed by the Governor. The Council membership shall be as follows: University of Idaho -- one (1); Idaho State University -- one (1); Boise State University -- one (1); Lewis-Clark State College -- one (1); non-institutional -- four (4); Statewide Science and Technology Advisor - one (1). The State Board of Education shall appoint the four college and university representatives and the four non-institutional representatives. The Governor's Statewide Science and Technology Advisor shall serve as an ex officio member with voting privileges. The chairman of the committee will be elected by the Council annually. Term length for the non-institutional members is three years.

Approved HERC/EPSCoR 5/98

### III. HERC SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PLAN

### **Vision Statement**

Improve both the quality of life and the standard of living of all Idaho citizens through public and private sector cooperative efforts in science and technology education and research.

#### Goals

- I. Enhance Idaho's competitiveness for public and private funding.
- II. Advocate public policy and the appropriate levels of public support and funding necessary to advance science and technology in Idaho.
- III. Benefit all regions of Idaho through application of science and technology to achieve economic expansion, increased business competitiveness and workforce development.
- IV. Facilitate public and private sector cooperation to expand Idaho's science and technology research capabilities.
- V. Develop and support science and technology education and communication among the many publics.
- VI. Attract and retain industry to provide high paying jobs in fields related to science and technology.
- VII. Retain highly trained graduates.

Revised 10/99

### IV. HERC BYLAWS

#### A. Membership

The membership, powers and duties of the Higher Education Research Council are in accordance with the Higher Education Research Council Policy as outlined in the Idaho State Board of Education's Governing Policies and Procedures. Additionally, members of HERC are ineligible to be a principal or co-principal investigator of a project funded through HERC.

### B. Administration of HERC Programs

Support for the Higher Education Research Council and administration of HERC sponsored programs will be coordinated by the Chief Academic Officer of the State Board of Education. The Chief Academic Officer also serves as an ex-officio member of the Higher Education Research Council without voting privileges.

### C. Meetings

- 1. HERC holds meetings as needed at the call of the Chair or the Board's Chief Academic Officer.
- 2. A quorum consists of five members. A quorum must be present for HERC to conduct business.
- 3. A summary of motions will be generated from each meeting and distributed back to the Council for approval. Once approved, this summary will be forwarded to the State Board of Education through the Academic Affairs and Program Committee, and to others as requested.

#### D. Officers

The officers of HERC include a Chair and a Vice-Chair, to be elected by the Council annually.

#### E. Executive Committee

- 1. An Executive Committee of the Council exists to make decisions on procedures and implementation of policy in cases where the time line is such that decisions are required before the next meeting of the Council. Any decisions made by the Executive Committee must be reported to the entire Council at its next meeting.
- 2. The Executive Committee consists of the HERC Chair, Vice-Chair, and two other members of HERC, with the stipulation that two members be institutional representatives and two members be non-institutional representatives.

Revised 10/99

### V. GRANT PROGRAMS – GENERAL GUIDELINES

#### A. Notification and Monitoring

Grant awards will be made on a fiscal year basis. When funding decisions for Infrastructure, Matching Grants, Research Center Grants, and Specific Research Center Grants are made, applicants will be notified in writing. Notification letters to both successful and unsuccessful applicants will include copies of reviews, minus reviewer identification information. In addition, successful applicants will be notified of project duration, due dates for progress and/or final reports, and expenditure requirements. Each institution should designate staff responsible for monitoring post award activities and fiscal progress of projects, including collecting final reports from PI's, and forwarding reports to the Office of the State Board of Education (OSBE). OSBE staff is responsible for ensuring receipt of final reports from campuses, reviewing reports for compliance with HERC and Board policies, and compiling research productivity information from final reports. Technical reporting requirements vary for each program. See specific reporting requirements in sections VI-IX for each grant program.

#### B. Post-Award Accountability

- 1. Any project receiving funding through a HERC administered program is required to report on its productivity, in a manner prescribed by the Office of the State Board of Education, with respect to the following items:
  - Number of students involved
  - Number of faculty involved
  - External funding earned as a result
  - Publications in refereed journals
  - Presentations at professional meetings and conferences
  - Patents awarded or pending
  - Economic benefits
  - Problem resolution
- 2. Any grant recipient who does not submit a final report within thirty days of the due date will be automatically ineligible to receive funding from any HERC program until such final report is submitted. If said final report is not received within two years, the recipient will be permanently ineligible to receive HERC funding.

### C. Remaining Funds

All unexpended grant funds must be returned to the Office of the State Board of Education annually for redistribution by HERC.

### D. Changes from the Original Proposal

In general, grant recipients are allowed a certain degree of latitude in making post-award programmatic changes and budget revisions. However, it is imperative that any changes made do not alter the original objectives as outlined in the project and approved by HERC and the Board.

- 1. Any replacement or significant change in the responsibilities of the principal investigator or coinvestigator must be reported to the Office of the State Board of Education.
- 2. In extraordinary circumstances, a project may require continuation beyond the approved project period. Under those circumstances, the principal investigator must make a written request for extension. Specific Research Grants will not be extended beyond 24 months.
- 3. Changes in budget line items in excess of 15% must be approved by the research offices at the institutions and the Office of the State Board notified.

Revised 10/99

### VI. INFRASTRUCTURE

A portion of the State's allocation to HERC for research programs is distributed to the institutions to enhance their research infrastructure.

#### A. Distribution

- 1. Distribution of funds for Infrastructure must be in accordance with the Board's HERC Policy, with funds reserved for library support essential to research, graduate research assistantships, post doctoral fellows, technician support, maintenance contracts, research equipment, competitively awarded summer research support, start up funds for new hires, and incentives to reward faculty for their research achievements.
- 2. Funds will be distributed to the institutions based on the following percentages:

University of Idaho: 40% Boise State University: 25% Idaho State University: 25% Lewis-Clark State College: 10%

### B. Reporting Procedures

Each institution is required to submit an annual report to the Office of the State Board of Education.

- 1. Reports are due on January 31, annually, nineteen months after the award date.
- 2. Reports should detail funding distribution to the categories listed above.
- 3. Reports should provide accountability information as described in section V.

Revised 10/99

### VII. MATCHING GRANTS

Matching Grant funds are intended to stimulate major research capabilities or programs within the State of Idaho. The types of research grants eligible for funding are major items of equipment or other major research projects. The Matching Grant category was created to help researchers become "nationally competitive."

- A. Guidelines for submission of proposals by the granting agency must <u>require</u> matching funds.
- B. The granting agency must be a national-level agency or meet the following guidelines. "Flow-through" funds such as DOE money made available in a matching format via a request for proposals by a contractor with DOE are eligible if the reviewers are recognized by HERC for their expertise and national prominence in a given discipline.
- C. Funding from local or regional foundations must include:
  - guidelines by the foundation requiring a match,
  - evidence that all four institutions have equal access to the matching grants funds, and
  - evidence the proposals are reviewed by individuals who are recognized experts in their discipline.

### D. Reporting Procedures

Each institution is required to submit an annual report to the Office of the State Board of Education.

- 1. Reports are due on January 31, annually, nineteen months after the award date.
- 2. Reports should provide accountability information as described in section V.

Revised 2/01

### VIII. RESEARCH CENTER GRANTS

The Research Center Grant Program (RCGP) is designed to provide funds to established research centers which enable researchers to make important advances that cannot be made readily by other approaches. Center funds are intended to build existing programs to bring them into national prominence and self-sufficiency.

#### Review Procedures

- A. A Request for Proposals (RFP) will be distributed to the four public institutions upon determination of funding availability and approval from HERC. (*included in the back of this section*)
- B. Proposal review forms will be created and distributed to reviewers in accordance with the criteria and guidelines as established in the RFP.
- C. The Research Center Grants peer review consists of a two-stage process.
  - 1. **Stage One** External review by experts in the discipline.
    - a. Staff at the State Board Office will recruit no fewer than six (6) reviewers from outside the State of Idaho for each proposal.
    - b. Staff will compile reviewer qualification summaries for each of the recruits. These summaries will include information pertinent to each reviewer's expertise and experience to help HERC determine eligibility to review. Summaries should not identify reviewers by name, but may include reference to institutional affiliation, educational background, recent journal publications, field of expertise, review experience and grants received, and any other applicable information.
    - c. HERC members will evaluate each reviewer qualification summary and rate potential reviewers as "acceptable" or "not acceptable." Any reviewer who receives two or more "not acceptable" votes will be disqualified.
    - d. Five reviewers from the approved pool will then be selected by the OSBE staff, with the stipulation that not more than one reviewer from any institution or organization will be used to review the same proposal and that not more than two of the five will be referrals from the project's principal investigator.
    - e. Reviews will be tracked and received in the OSBE.
      - (1) Staff will use only the four highest scores received to calculate the proposal's average score.

(2) Staff will compile a report listing the proposals in rank order by average score. HERC will use this data when making their recommendation to advance the top three proposals to the second stage.

### 2. **Stage Two** - On-Site Evaluations

- a. Proposals with the top three ranking scores and approved by HERC to advance to the second stage will be reviewed by an on-site evaluation team consisting of three peer reviewers from stage one (one per project), and four research administrators, one of whom will serve as the chairperson.
- b. Staff at the State Board office will recruit at least eight potential research administrators from outside the State of Idaho.
- c. Staff will compile reviewer qualification summaries for each of the recruits. These summaries will include information pertinent to each administrator's expertise and experience to help HERC determine eligibility to review. Summaries may identify administrators by name, and should include reference to institutional affiliation, educational background, and any other applicable information.
- d. HERC members will review each reviewer qualification summary and rate potential reviewers as "acceptable" or "not acceptable." Any reviewer who receives two or more "not acceptable" votes will be disqualified.
- e. HERC members will indicate their choice for Chair of the panel.
- f. Four administrators from the approved pool will then be selected by the OSBE staff.
- g. OSBE staff will:
  - (1) Coordinate travel arrangements, schedules and preliminary agendas for the on-site reviews.
  - (2) Provide on-site team members with copies of the top ranked proposals along with the first stage reviews for each.
  - (3) Provide on-site team members, principal investigators and HERC members with the on-site evaluation policies, the RCGP RFP, final report formatting guidelines, daily schedule and accommodation information, and any other information pertinent to the on-site reviews.
- h. Each on-site reviewer will be paid a \$250 per day honorarium, plus be provided with all travel and lodging expenses. The panel Chair will be provided an additional \$250 honorarium for serving as Chair.
- i. The HERC Chair and/or the SBOE's Chief Academic Officer will accompany the on-site team during all of their meetings and functions.
- j. The second stage review will begin with an orientation meeting for the on-site team members.
- k. Each proposed Center will have one day devoted to its review, and should arrange for the panel to meet with the appropriate administrators (President, Provost, Financial Vice President, and Research Vice President), plus the center director, faculty and students. All evaluations must be conducted in a uniform and equitable manner.
- 1. The panel Chair and the Center Director may alter the itinerary as necessary; however, the HERC Chair or the SBOE's Chief Academic Officer must approve any changes to assure that the uniformity and equity of reviews will be maintained.
- m. Any unauthorized contact or attempt to contact panel members by institutional representatives before or during the evaluation may result in the institution's disqualification.

- n. The criteria established and used in the first stage review will be the same as for the onsite review.
- o. The on-site evaluation team will compile a final report listing the proposed centers in rank order, along with a funding recommendation.
- p. OSBE staff will assist in compiling the evaluation team's comments and recommendations. Final approval of team comments and recommendations must come from the Chair of the on-site evaluation team.
- D. HERC will base their funding recommendation on the evaluation panel's final report.

### E. Reporting Procedures

Each funded center is required to submit an annual report to the Office of the State Board of Education on the date specified in the funding notification letter.

- (1) Each annual report should summarize Center accomplishments and plans for the coming year.
- (2) Reports should provide accountability information as described in Section V.

## RESEARCH CENTER GRANT PROGRAM REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

### **Eligible Institutions:**

- Boise State University
- Idaho State University
- Lewis Clark State College
- University of Idaho

### **Intent and Purposes of Research Centers:**

The Idaho State Board of Education's Higher Education Research Council Policy recommends that funds be provided to establish focused research centers that enable researchers to make important advances that cannot be made readily by other approaches. Therefore, the intent of such centers is to have three or more faculty members with the accompanying necessary equipment and support personnel to establish a focused research effort that will lead to the investigators and the center becoming nationally recognized for their work or for their excellence, and nationally competitive for extramural research funding. All disciplines are eligible to apply for funding for the establishment of such centers, but will not be considered if they do not have high potential for obtaining significant funding from extramural sources. Center funds are intended to build existing programs to bring them into national prominence and self-sufficiency, and not to fund completely new endeavors. Therefore, it is unlikely that research center support may be obtained if a proposal is not based on significant existing research activity and strength at one or more institutions in the state. Additionally, any research center that receives one million dollars or greater per three investigators for each of the past three years is ineligible for the RCGP competition. Centers may be established at any one of the four-year institutions or may be a collaborative effort between two or more institutions within the state, which is encouraged.

### **Features of SBOE Research Centers:**

SBOE Research centers should have a unifying research focus involving any field or research supported by the SBOE. The Research centers may vary in size and exhibit diverse forms of organization, participation and operation. No single type of center fits the needs of every field. Rather, the size, structure, and operation of the Research center is determined by the proposed research.

While Centers are unique in some respects, each Center must:

- 1. Be based in an institution;
- 2. Be directed by a tenure-tracked faculty member and integrated into academic programs;
- 3. Have tangible resource commitments that reflect the priorities of the home institution(s) and other institutional collaborators;
- 4. Provide a variety of education and research opportunities for students and faculty (e.g., undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, industrial fellows, and faculty members from other college and universities.)

- 5. Not be substantially supported by the Matching Grant Award Category funded by the SBOE. Any individual supported by SBOE funds is eligible to participate in Research Center proposals.
- 6. Provide significant evidence that the center will contribute to the economy of the state.

#### **Number of Proposals to be Funded:**

Only one new center shall be funded in this year's competition.

### **Internal Review:**

An internal review process must be used to identify the best proposals and those that best fit the priorities of the institution. Since the SBOE intends to fund only one new center, it is the responsibility of the institution to identify those areas of research that it wishes to improve in a major way.

#### **Center Director:**

The Center Director and the institution are responsible for developing an administrative structure that will allow the Director to provide strong leadership to promote research and teaching. The Center Director is responsible for the management, staffing, and resource allocation of the Research Center.

#### **Deadlines:**

Proposals must be submitted to the State Board of Education office in Boise no later than *MM/DD/YY* for consideration for funding in FYXXXX. Notices of Intent should be submitted to the State Board Office in advance (*MM/DD/YY*) of the proposal deadline.

#### **Notice of Intent:**

A notice of intent to submit a research center proposal must be submitted to the State Board Office by *MM/DD/YY*. The notice of intent should be submitted in hard copy and/or electronically computer disk. Proposals sent without having first submitted a notice of intent will not be accepted.

#### **SBOE Research Center Awards**:

Research center awards will be made with an initial commitment of up to three years. The size of SBOE's investment in each Center will depend upon the needs, plans, and opportunities offered by the Center as well as the availability of State funds. Proposed budgets may range from \$250,000 to \$350,000 per year. Planning grants are not a component of this solicitation.

The Higher Education Research Council (HERC) will have a primary role in oversight of the Research centers. The progress and plans of each funded Research center will be assessed annually. The Center Director shall prepare a summary progress report for HERC detailing Center accomplishments and plans for the coming year. Toward the end of the third year of operation, each Research center's progress and future plans will be evaluated comprehensively. The outcome performance review will determine if the Research center is meeting the goals and objectives as originally planned.

#### **Proposal Content:**

The proposal should be prepared following the instructions under Proposal Format and should contain only material itemized in that section. Proposals that do not adhere to the specified page and word limitations will be ineligible for consideration.

The proposal should reflect the unique combination of the proposing institution's interests and capabilities. As detailed under Proposal Format, the proposal should clearly and concisely justify center support. Consequently, important components of the proposal are: **focus, research plans, and relevance**; **education and outreach**; **rationale**; **and management plan.** These sections should be presented in sufficient detail to be evaluated in accordance with the selection criteria below.

### **Proposal Format**:

Each page of the proposal must be no more than 26 lines, using 12-point font. The original signed copy must be printed only on one side of each sheet. Additional copies may be printed on both sides. Proposals that do not adhere to the specified page limitations, including those in the required appendices, will be ineligible for consideration.

Each proposal must contain the following elements in the order indicated:

- 1. <u>SBOE Cover Page</u> (See page 11): Indicate the total amount requested for the three-year period rounded to the nearest hundred dollars.
- 2. Table of Contents: Key page numbers to the major sections of the proposal.
- 3. <u>Executive Summary</u>: Provide a clear description of the Center, its distinguishing features, unifying intellectual focus and proposed research, education and outreach, and rationale for the center (up to 6 pages).
- 4. <u>Description of the Focus, Research Plans, and Relevance</u>: Develop a research focus that is sufficiently long term to justify a center form of organization and broad enough to permit change as the research proceeds. Describe the Center's goals and proposed research activities in sufficient detail to allow assessment of their merit for the discipline and the necessity for the center mode of operation. Indicate what impact the Center's research will have on the state's overall research reputation regionally and nationally (up to 40 pages, excluding references).
- 5. <u>Education and Outreach</u>: Clearly outline plans for attracting and involving high-quality students (undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral) in Center activities. If a significant research partnership with other state agencies, federal agencies, private institutions, or other entities is part of the focus of the Center, clearly identify these relationships and the specific contributions, which will be made by these partners with respect to personnel and funds. Letters of commitment by the appropriate officials should be attached to the appendices of the proposal (up to 5 pages).
- 6. Rationale for the Center: Justify the Center mode. Clearly indicate current activities, why a Center is necessary and what unique opportunities will be provided by the proposed center. If the proposed Center's research is closely related to ongoing research at an existing Center in Idaho (e.g., national laboratory), explain how the research activities of this Center complement those of the existing Center (up to 6 pages).

- 7. <u>Management Plan</u>: Provide a clear description of the organizational structure of the Center. Clearly outline mechanisms for focusing Center activities, selecting and integrating research projects, allocating funds and equipment, and managing the involvement of other groups, and identify the measures the center will use to assess its performance (up to 4 pages).
- 8. <u>Budget</u>: Include a proposed three-year budget and separate annual budgets for each year. Identify items of equipment costing more than \$5,000.
- 9. <u>Budget Narrative</u>: A description of the role of personnel or the nature and purpose of other expenditures should be included for each item in the personnel categories; a description of need for and purpose of equipment for all expenditures over \$1,000; a description of purpose and destination of proposed travel expenditures; an explanation of role of additional participants and the nature of expenditures involved; and description of expenditures under Another direct costs.
- 10. <u>Institutional and Other Sector Support</u>: Outline and describe the home institution's commitment: dollars, space, faculty and staff positions, capital equipment, and access to facilities and instrumentation. Describe projected other sector support, including space, funds, facilities, and people for the Center (up to 5 pages).

### **Appendices**:

- 1. <u>Facilities and Equipment</u>: Include a description of the available facilities, plans for purchase of and justification for major items of equipment, and plans for new or renovated space (up to 4 pages).
- 2. <u>Biographical Sketching and Individual Support</u>: Provide a one- to two-page biographical sketch that includes the five most relevant publications and a complete listing of current support for PI's and co-PI's. A full CV of the Center Director is required. Provide a description of qualifications of and services expected from all visiting professors and postdoctoral associates. This appendix may be single-spaced.
- 3. Provide official letters that verify specific institutional and other sector resource commitments.

### **Evaluation of Proposals:**

### **Review and Awards Selection Process**

The review will consist of a two-stage process. The first stage will involve an external (out-of-state) mail review by experts in the discipline, and the second stage will involve an on-site visit by a panel of external peer reviewers to not more than three of the highest-ranked research center sites as a consequence of the first peer review process. HERC and the staff of the State Board of Education will be responsible for the entire review process. HERC will make the final recommendation for funding after receiving the reports from the reviewers. The reviewers will be asked to assess the proposals on the following criteria:

- 1. <u>Intrinsic merit of the research</u>: The overall quality of the proposed research and the likelihood that the research will lead to a significant contribution to the field, the institution, and the state.
- 2. <u>Research performance competence</u>: The capability of the investigator(s), the technical soundness of the proposed approach, and the adequacy of the institutional resources available or proposed, including existing or planned facilities.
- 3. <u>Effect of the Center</u>: The Center's impact on enhancing education of researchers, students and the benefits to the state.
- 4. <u>Rationale for the Center</u>: Assessment of whether the center mode and structure are essential, appropriate, and will enhance the conduct of the proposed research activities.
- 5. <u>Potential for Researchers becoming Nationally Competitive</u>: Assessment of the Center's impact for improving the capability of the researchers and the focused research approach to attract extramural funding.
- 6. <u>Institutional Support and Management Plan</u>: The level and nature of the institutional (home and other sector) commitments to the Center and the likely effectiveness of the management plan. Additional issues include: reasonableness and appropriateness of the budget and plans for interactions of the staff of the Center with the rest of the sponsoring institution, and the mechanisms to be used to assess outcome based performance.

### **Proposal Submission:**

- 1. All proposals and notices of intent must be submitted by the Director of the Grants and Contracts Office or the primary research officer of the institution.
- 2. **One copy** of the notice of intent along with a version on computer disk must be submitted by *MM/DD/YY*.
- 3. Fourteen (14) copies of the proposal must be submitted, one of which must carry the signatures of the appropriate fiscal officer, primary academic officer and the president of the institution and be printed on one side only.
- 4. Proposals should be securely fastened together but not placed in ring binders.
- 5. Specific questions about proposals beyond the details of this document should be directed to the Chief Academic Officer of the State Board of Education.

PROPOSAL FORMS ARE AVAILABLE AT THE BOARD OFFICE OR AT <a href="http://www.idahoboardofed.org/herc/grants/rfp.asp">http://www.idahoboardofed.org/herc/grants/rfp.asp</a>.

Revised 10/99

### IX. SPECIFIC RESEARCH GRANTS

Researchers from all academic disciplines at Idaho's public college and universities may request funds for both applied or basic research. A major focus of these funds will be start up and seed funds to assist faculty in competing for external funding. The program provides faculty an opportunity to pursue creative research, to become nationally recognized in their fields of expertise, has an impact on graduate students and helps attract quality faculty to Idaho. Projects must demonstrate economic benefit or cost savings for the State, and collaboration is encouraged.

#### **Review Procedures**

- A. A Request for Proposals (RFP) will be distributed to the four public institutions upon determination of funding availability and approval from HERC. (*included in the back of this section*)
- B. Proposal review forms will be created and distributed to reviewers in accordance with the criteria and guidelines as established in the RFP.
- C. The Specific Research Grants will be evaluated by external peer reviewers.
  - 1. Staff at the State Board Office will recruit at least four reviewers who are recognized as experts in the field of proposed study from outside the State of Idaho for each proposal.
  - 2. At least two of the reviewers must be recruited from sources other than the principal investigator.
  - 3. Curricula vitae, resumes or related biographical information must be kept on file for all reviewers selected.
  - 4. Reviews will be tracked and received in the OSBE.
    - (1) Staff will use only the three highest scores received to calculate the proposal's average score.
    - (2) Staff will compile a report listing the proposals in rank order by average score. HERC will use this data when making their funding recommendation.

### D. Reporting Procedures

Each funded project is required to submit an annual report to the Office of the State Board of Education approximately nineteen months after the award date and as specified in the funding notification letter.

- 1. Reports should summarize research accomplished.
- 2. Reports should provide accountability information as described in Section V.

## SPECIFIC RESEARCH GRANT PROGRAM REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

### **INFORMATION**

- 1. Project <u>forms</u> are to be filled out by the principal investigator and any co-principal investigator(s). The forms contained in this RFP must be used and may be reproduced. Copies will not be provided by the SBOE. Forms can be acquired from the research office of the respective institutions.
- 2. Completed proposals must be submitted to the State Board of Education by 5:00 P.M., *MM/DD/YY*. The proposals must first be screened at the originating institution for adherence to the RFP guidelines and commercial application for the state of Idaho. Only those that meet all requirements and show commercial application for the state of Idaho should be forwarded to the State Board Office. The State Board staff will organize the proposals and administer an external peer review for each proposal according to the field. Peer reviewers will use the excellent, very good, good, fair, poor rating system of evaluation. The Higher Education Research Council will recommend grant recipients to the State Board on the basis of the peer review results. Awarding of funds for research projects is presently planned for *MM/DD/YY*.
- 3. The amount of money the SBOE will award this year will not exceed \$35,000 per proposal.
- 4. The total amount of money to be awarded for specific research projects for FYXXXX will be approximately \$500,000. However, this is dependent upon the Legislature appropriating at least the same amount as last year. There is no limit or formula giving minimum or maximum fractions of the \$500K, which any one of the four state-supported institutions can obtain. It is possible that all or none of the \$500K could go to a single institution based on the judged excellence of the proposals submitted by all the institutions.
- 5. There is no limit on the number of proposals submitted by any of the four institutions. However, only one project for a principal investigator or co-principal investigator will be funded in any given year.
- 6. Projects selected for funding will receive monies in *MM/DD/YY*. The duration of support will be for one year, with an automatic six-month, no-cost extension added. All funds must be expended within 24 months.
- 7. No single project will be supported by more than two grants from the SBOE. A second proposal to support the same project may be submitted for one additional period of support after the completion of two SRGP cycles. It will be placed in competition with others for that year.
- 8. Proposal packages should be addressed to:

(**If Courier service**) Idaho Board of Education 650 W. State Street #307 Boise, Idaho, 83702 (If U.S. Postal service) Idaho Board of Education PO Box 83720 Boise, ID 83720-0037

### **ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS**

Every state institution designated as a university or four-year college is eligible to submit research project proposals under the Specific Research Grant Program. A major focus under this program should be start-up funds and seed monies that would make the proposed research competitive for external funding after completion of the project. Additional requirements are:

- 1. The principal investigator and any co-principal investigator(s) submitting Specific Research proposals must be full-time, tenure-track faculty. Consideration may be given to other individuals under special circumstances.
- 2. No principal investigator or co-principal investigator shall be funded more than once every third year of the Specific Research Grant Program.
- 3. A faculty member who has received competitive grant funds from nationally competitive grant programs sponsored by federal agencies for six of the previous 10 consecutive years (as defined by the official grant initiation and termination dates) while employed in Idaho's system of higher education is ineligible for funding. A federal agency is defined as those agencies listed as follows: NSF, NASA, DOE, NIH, USDA, EPA, ONR, NEA, NEH, U.S. Dept. of Education, and any other federal agency which has a national competition for research funds. Excluded are those awards granted to individuals that are "flow through" federal funds to states or funds that are awarded only by local or regional competition.

The principal investigator and any co-principal investigator(s) are designated by the grantee institution. These individuals will receive credit for any accomplishments from the proposed work and must meet all requirements listed above. Contact the Chief Academic Officer of the SBOE with any questions regarding eligibility requirements.

### **GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS**

These guidelines are for proposal submission in all disciplines. The format described herein must be used.

### **Contents of the Proposal**

The proposal should present the:

- 1. Objectives and significance of the proposed work;
- 2. Suitability of the methods to be employed;
- 3. Qualifications of the investigator(s) and the grantee organization;
- 4. Effect of the activity on the infrastructure of science, engineering, social sciences, the humanities, the arts, or of education in these areas;
- 5. Commercial application for the state of Idaho;
- 6. Amount of funding required.

The proposal should be reviewed carefully to ensure that all essential parts are included. A checklist is provided for this purpose. The Board expects strict adherence to the rules of proper scholarship and attribution, which are at the heart of the organization of research, the communication of its results, and the competitive merit review system on the basis of which awards will be made. The responsibility for proper attribution and citation rests with authors of a research proposal. Failure to adhere to such standards will result in disqualification of the proposal.

### Format of the Proposal

To facilitate processing, the original should be bound with a binder or paper clip and not stapled. Other copies should be stapled in the upper left-hand corner, with pages numbered at the bottom and a 1-inch margin at the top. The original signed copy must be printed only on one side of each sheet. Additional copies may be printed on both sides. Six copies of the proposal, including the original signed copy, must be submitted. Contents must be assembled in the sequence given in the proposal checklist.

An electronic copy of the proposal would be of assistance in recruiting peer reviewers. PIs may submit a copy on disk or by email to \_\_\_\_\_\_. Submission of the proposal electronically is in addition to the six paper copies of the proposal described in the above paragraph.

The project description may not exceed 10 pages, with a maximum of 26 lines per page and using a 12- point font. Failure to adhere to these guidelines will result in disqualification of the proposal. Tables and graphs must be included in the 10 pages reserved for the project description. Appended information must not be used to circumvent the page limitation. However, in exceptional circumstances where visualization of materials through computer resources provides important information/demonstration about the project that cannot be made available through a printed text, a proposal may include a computer disk containing this information. The disk must be accompanied by a printed narrative explaining the unusual circumstances and the nature of the visual materials on the computer disk. This narrative explanation/demonstration, which may be no longer than one double-spaced page, in a 12-point font, should be submitted to the State Board Office for review and approval no later than *MM/DD/YY*. PIs will be notified of their approval or disapproval in time to meet the proposal submission deadline.

The following are <u>not</u> included in the 10 page limit.

- 1. A one-page description of the commercial application for the state of Idaho
- 2. A one-page Project Summary
- 3. Results from Prior SBOE Support
- 4. Bibliography
- 5. Biographical Sketches
- 6. Eligibility Requirement Sheet
- 7. Budget and Budget Explanation Page(s)
- 8. Description of Facilities and Equipment
- 9. Current and Pending Support Form
- 10. List of Suggested Reviewers
- 11. Documentation as needed for special considerations (see appendix)

### Cover Page (Form A)

The title of the proposed project should be brief, informative and intelligible to a literate reader in the discipline and suitable for use in the public press. The Board may edit the title of a project before making an award.

Proposals must be approved by the appropriate institutional officer. One copy of the proposal must be signed by the principal investigator and any co-principal investigator and an official authorized to commit the institution in business and financial affairs. Proposing organizations may have additional signature requirements. Other copies must record the names and titles of those who have signed the original. Proposals are incomplete if endorsement signatures are omitted.

#### **Table of Contents**

A table of contents is required. It should show the location of each section of the proposal as well as major subdivisions of the project description, such as the summary of previous work, statement of proposed research or scholarly or creative activity, and methods and procedures to be used.

### **Commercial Application Description**

A one-page (maximum 26 lines, using a 12-point font) description of the anticipated commercial application of the project for the state of Idaho must be included. The name(s) of the originating institution, principal investigator, co-principal investigator(s), and any others involved in the project should not be identified by name in this description. It should list the title of the project at the top followed by the narrative. It should be attached to the original only. This description will be reviewed by HERC to determine eligibility to compete in the Board's Specific Research Grant Program. Principal investigators will be notified if a project was not accepted for the SRGP competition. Failure to include this description or to adhere to the aforementioned guidelines will result in automatic ineligibility.

### **Project Summary**

The proposal must contain a one-page summary (maximum 26 lines, using a 12-point font) of the proposed activity, suitable for publication. This summary must not be an abstract of the proposal, but rather a self-contained description of the activity that would result if the proposal were funded. The summary must include:

- 1. A statement of objectives.
- 2. Methods to be employed.
- 3. Significance of the proposed activity to the advancement of knowledge.

It should be informative to other persons working in the same or related field and, insofar as possible, understandable to a literate reader in the discipline.

### **Results from Prior SBOE Support**

If the principal investigator or co-principal investigator(s) has received an SBOE award in the past, information on the prior award is required:

- 1. The SBOE award number, amount, and period of support.
- 2. The title of the project.
- 3. A summary of the results of the completed work. This summary must not exceed the equivalent of two pages, 26 lines per page.
- 4. List of publications that resulted from the SBOE award.
- 5. If the proposal is for renewal of a grant, a description of the relation of the completed work to the proposed work. Please note that only one "renewal" grant is permissible and that an application for renewal may not be submitted before two additional funding cycles have passed.

If the applicant has received more than one prior award, the applicant must provide the information requested for the prior award which is most closely related to the proposal. Peer reviewers may be asked to comment on the quality of the prior work described in this section.

### **Project Description**

The main body of the proposal should be a detailed statement of the work to be undertaken and should include:

- 1. General plan of work, including the broad design of activities to be undertaken.
- 2. Adequate description of methods and procedures.
- 3. Objectives for the period of the proposed work and expected significance or contribution to the field.
- 4. Relation to longer-term goals of the investigator's project.
- 5. Relation to the present state of knowledge in the field including work in progress by the investigator and work in progress elsewhere.
- 6. Description of any substantial collaboration with individuals not referred to in the budget should be described.
- 7. Documentation of such collaboration with a letter from each collaborator should be included as an appendix.
- 8. The specific contributions the proposed work will make toward expanding or developing the knowledge and technology base.
- 9. (For science and engineering proposals only).
  Potential new discoveries or advances that are expected as a result of the research.

### **Special Guidelines for Equipment**

Proposals that request equipment must list potential uses and a description of its use(s) as it relates to the project. The descriptions should be succinct and should emphasize the intrinsic merit of the activity for the discipline and the importance of any equipment to it. A brief summary will suffice for auxiliary users of equipment.

The Board, for the purpose of these proposals, defines equipment as an item of property that has an acquisition cost of \$500 or more and an expected service life of 2 or more years. Items of needed equipment costing \$1,000 or more must be listed individually with description and estimated cost, including tax, and adequately justified.

Allowable items will ordinarily be limited to scientific equipment and apparatus that are not already available for the conduct of the work. With the exception of computers and computer-related equipment such as software, general-purpose office equipment will normally not be considered eligible for support.

The purchase of equipment with grant funds must follow the guidelines used in other equipment purchased by the institution. It must also follow restrictions and requirements for equipment purchases by the State.

#### **Bibliography**

A bibliography of pertinent literature is required. Citations must be completed according to the standard format used in the discipline of the proposal.

### **Biographical Sketches**

Vitae of senior personnel and a list of each investigator's publications during the past 5 years, including those in press, must be provided. The vitae must list only academic essentials. Proposals including equipment purchases in excess of \$1000 per item must include a brief biographical sketch and a list of publications for each user.

For the personnel categories listed below, the proposal may include information or exceptional qualifications of the individual that merit consideration in the evaluation of the proposal.

- Postdoctoral associates
- Other professionals
- Graduate students (research assistants)

#### Budget (Form B)

Each proposal must contain a budget for the term of support requested. The proposal may request funds under any of the headings listed in the budget format as applicable to the proposed project. No indirect costs are permitted. The total amount of funds requested should be rounded to the nearest **hundred** dollars.

#### **Salaries and Wages**

The proposal must list:

- 1. The names of the principal investigator and any co-principal investigator(s), faculty, and other senior associates.
- 2. The estimated number of academic-year, summer, or calendar-year person-months for which SBOE funding is requested.

For postdoctoral associates and other professionals, each position must be listed, with the number of full-time-equivalent person-months and rate of pay (hourly, monthly, or annual). For graduate and undergraduate students, secretarial, clerical, technical, etc., only the total number of persons and total amount of salaries per year in each category are required. Salaries requested must be consistent with the institution's regular practices.

The Board regards research as one of the normal functions of faculty members at institutions of higher education. Compensation for time normally spent on research within the term of appointment is deemed to be included within the faculty member's regular institutional salary. Grant funds may not be used to augment the total salary or rate of salary of faculty members during the period covered by the term of faculty appointment or to reimburse faculty members for consulting or other time in addition to a regular full-time institutional salary covering the same general period of employment. However, grant funds may be used to purchase release time for faculty members to conduct the proposed research during their term of appointment. Purchase of release time should be clearly identified so it will not be confused with requests for supplemental income, which is not permissible during the academic year. Further, summer salary for faculty members on academic-year appointments will be funded for no more than three-ninths of their regular academic-year salary.

The budget may request funds for support of graduate student research assistants to help carry out the proposed research. Compensation classified as salary payments must be requested in the salaries and wages category. Any direct costs requested for tuition remission may be listed separately under "Other Direct Costs," or "Fringe Benefits," as appropriate.

#### **Fringe Benefits**

Fringe benefits must be treated as direct costs, reimbursable under the grant.

#### **Travel**

Travel in the United States and its possessions, Puerto Rico, and Canada is considered domestic travel; all other is foreign. The proposal must include relevant information, including countries to be visited and dates of visit, if known, and justification for any foreign travel planned in connection with the project. Each foreign trip not specifically included and authorized in the grant budget must receive advance written approval by the SBOE if grant funds are to be used.

Allowance for air travel normally will not exceed the cost of round-trip, economy air fare. Persons traveling under SBOE grants or contracts must travel by U.S. flag carriers, if available.

The type and extent of travel and its relation to the proposed activities must be specified. Funds may be requested for:

- 1. Field work.
- 2. Attendance at meetings and conferences associated with the proposed work.
- 3. Other travel and subsistence associated with the proposed work.

In order to qualify for support, attendance at meetings or conferences must enhance the investigator's ability to:

- 1. Perform the work.
- 2. Plan extensions of it.
- 3. Disseminate its results.

#### **Participant Support Costs**

This budget category refers to costs of transportation, per diem, stipends, and other related costs for participants in SBOE-sponsored conferences and workshops.

### **Other Direct Costs**

The budget must itemize other anticipated direct costs not included under the headings above, including materials and supplies, publication costs, computer services, and consultant services (which are discussed below). Other examples are: aircraft rental, space rental at research establishments away from the grantee institution, minor building alterations, payments to human subjects, service charges, and construction of equipment or systems not available off-the-shelf. Reference books and periodicals may be charged to the grant only if they specifically relate to the project.

**Materials and Supplies:** The budget must indicate in general terms the type of expendable materials and supplies required, with their estimated costs. The breakdown must be more detailed when the cost is substantial.

**Publication Costs/Page Charges:** The budget may request funds for the costs of preparing and publishing the results of the work conducted under the grant, including costs of reports, reprints, page charges, or other journal costs (except costs for prior or early publication), and necessary illustrations.

**Consultant Services:** Anticipated consultant services and costs must be justified, and information furnished on each individual's expertise, primary organizational affiliation, daily compensation rate, number of days of expected service and travel expenses.

**Computer Services:** The cost of computer services, including computer-based retrieval of scientific, technical, and educational information, may be requested. A justification on the established computer service rates at the proposing institution must be included. The budget also may request costs, which must be shown to be reasonable, for leasing automatic data-processing equipment. The purchase of computers and associated hardware and software must be requested as items of equipment.

**Subcontracts**: None of the activities under an SBOE grant may be contracted out or transferred to any organization without prior, written approval by the SBOE. Subcontracts must be disclosed in the proposal so that the grant letter can contain their prior approval. There must be a complete budget, in the prescribed format, for each subcontract. The total amount of each subcontract must appear as a line item under "Other Direct Costs" in the master budget for the project. Collaborative work with another investigator at another state of Idaho institution eligible for these funds (LCSC, BSU, ISU and U of I) may be reflected as a subcontract. However, the total amount requested under these arrangements must not exceed \$25,000.

### **Current and Pending Support (Form C)**

The format for reporting all current and pending support for ongoing projects and proposals is given below. All current project support from any source must be listed. The list must include the proposed project and all other projects requiring a portion of time of the principal investigator, co-principal investigator(s) and other senior personnel, even if they receive no salary support from the project(s). The number of person-months or percentage of effort to be devoted to the projects must be stated, regardless of source support. Similar information must be provided for all proposals that are being considered by or will be submitted soon to other possible sponsors, including NSF, NASA, DOE, NIH, Agriculture, EPA, ONR, NEA, NEH, U.S. Dept. of Education, and any other federal agency which have a national competition for research funds.

If the proposed project has been funded previously by a source other than SBOE, the information requested in the paragraph above must be furnished for the immediately preceding funding period.

If the proposal is being submitted to other possible sponsors, all of them must be listed. Concurrent submission of a proposal to other organizations will not prejudice its review by the SBOE.

### Previous Federal Agency Competitive Grants (Form D)

List all federal agency grant awards stemming from national competitive grant programs that the principal investigator(s) has received during the previous 10 year period. The listing must include: (a) the P.I.(s), (b) title, (c) the federal agency, (d) the official award number, and (e) the official initiation and termination dates.

#### **Facilities and Equipment**

An appendix must be added to the proposal describing available facilities. Major items of equipment to be used in the proposed work should be described if they are of a specialized nature and essential to the performance of the project.

Equipment to be purchased, modified, or constructed must be described in sufficient detail to allow comparison of its capabilities to the needs of the proposed activities. Whenever, possible, the proposal should specify the manufacturer and model number.

Proposals requesting multiple-use equipment must describe comparable equipment that is already at the proposing organization and explain why it cannot be used. The degree of utilization must be discussed.

Equipment proposals must also describe arrangements for maintenance and operation, including:

- 1. a biographical sketch of the person(s) who will have overall responsibility for maintenance and operation, and a brief statement of his or her qualifications, if the sketch does not make them obvious.
- 2. a description of the physical facility where the equipment will be located, including floor plans or other data if appropriate.
- 3. annual budget for operation and maintenance of the proposed equipment, indicating source of funds.

4. a brief description of other support services available, particularly related equipment, and the annual budget for their operation, maintenance, and administration.

Special-purpose equipment having a unit acquisition cost of more than \$10,000 and purchased or leased with grant funds will be subject to reasonable inventory controls, maintenance procedures, and organizational policies that enhance its multiple or shared use on other projects, if such use does not interfere with the work for which the equipment was acquired.

#### **Special Considerations**

A project involving any item listed below must include special information and supporting documents in the proposal, normally in an appendix, before funding can be approved. Some of these are mandated by Federal law.

- 1. Animal Welfare.
- 2. Endangered Species.
- 3. Human Subjects.
- 4. Marine Mammal Protection.
- 5. Pollution Control.
- 6. National Environment Policy Act.
- 7. Recombinant DNA/RNA Molecules.
- 8. Historical Sites.
- 9. International Cooperative Activity.
- 10. Research Opportunity Award.
- 11. Facilitation Award for Handicapped.
- 12. Proprietary and Privileged Information (including matters with national security implications).
- 13. Collaborative Arrangements (any cooperative agreements to use the services or material of another university or institution).

Documentation must be provided to support other federal or university requirements. Specific guidance on the need for additional documentation may be obtained from SBOE staff.

### PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals that are accepted to compete in the SRGP after review by HERC on the commercial application for the state of Idaho will be sent out for an external peer review. The proposal evaluation criteria to be used in the peer review process are:

- 1. Likelihood that the proposal can be accomplished, based on:
  - Qualifications/capabilities of the investigator(s).
  - > Soundness of the proposed approach.
  - Adequacy and appropriateness of the available resources.
- 2. Merit of the proposal, based on:
  - Likelihood that the proposed work will lead to new discoveries, new knowledge, or fundamental advances in the field.
- 3. Relevance of the proposed work to extrinsic goals such as:
  - ➤ New or improved technology.
  - > Economic development.
  - > Solution of societal problems.
  - Addition to public awareness and appreciation of the field.

Criteria 1, 2, and 3 constitute an integral set and are applied in a balanced way to all research proposals in accordance with the objectives and content of each proposal. Criterion 1, performance competence, is essential to the evaluation of the quality of every proposal. The relative weight given Criteria 2 and 3 depends on the nature of the proposed work. Criterion 2, intrinsic merit, is emphasized in the evaluation of basic research proposals, while Criterion 3, utility or relevance, is emphasized in the evaluation of applied research proposals. Criterion 3 also relates to major goal-oriented activities, such as those directed at improving the knowledge base underlying science and technology policy, furthering international cooperation in science and engineering, and addressing areas of national need. Similar impacts for other disciplines such as business, social sciences, arts and humanities, with respect to improving the knowledge base underlying policy and/or understanding the discipline, fit this criterion.

### INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE OF SUMMARY PROPOSAL BUDGET

#### General

- 1. Each grant proposal must contain a Summary Proposal Budget in this format.
- 2. Completion of this summary does not eliminate the need to fully document and justify the amounts requested in each category. Such documentation must be provided on additional page(s) immediately following the budget in the proposal and must be identified by line item. The documentation page(s) must be titled "Budget Explanation Page."

#### **Budget Line Items**

Following is a brief outline of budget line items that require documentation on the Budget Explanation Page.

- **A., B. and C. Salaries, Wages and Fringe Benefits**: Fully justify on Budget Explanation Page(s).
- **D. Permanent Equipment:** While items exceeding \$500 and 2 years useful life are defined as permanent equipment, it is only necessary to list item and dollar amount for each item exceeding \$1,000. Fully justify.
- **E. Travel:** Address the type and extent of travel and its relation to the project. Itemize by destination and cost and justify travel outside the United State and its possessions, Puerto Rico and Canada. Include dates of foreign visits or meetings. Fare allowances are limited to round-trip, jet-economy rates.
- **F. Participant Support Costs:** Normally, participant support may only be requested for grants supporting conferences, workshops, or symposia.

#### **G. Other Direct Costs:**

- 1. Materials and Supplies. Indicate types required and estimate costs.
- 2. Publications Costs/Page Charges. Estimate cost of preparing and publishing project results.
- 3. Consultant Services. Indicate name, daily compensation, estimated days of service, travel, and justify.
- 4. Computer Services. Include justification based on established computer service rates at the proposing institution. Purchase of equipment is included under D.
- 5. Subcontracts. Include a complete budget and justify details.
- 6. Other. Itemize and justify. Include computer equipment leasing.

APPLICANTS MUST NOT ALTER OR REARRANGE THE COST CATEGORIES AS THEY APPEAR ON THIS FORM. IMPROPER COMPLETION OF THIS FORM MAY RESULT IN RETURN OF PROPOSAL TO APPLICANT AND ELIMINATION FROM COMPETITION.

#### **Definitions of Categories of Personnel**

The personnel categories listed in parts A and B of the proposed budget are defined as follows:

#### A. Senior Personnel

The principal investigator and any co-principal investigator(s) so designated by the grantee institution. A faculty associate (faculty member) is an individual other than the principal investigator or co-principal investigator who is considered by the performing institution to be a member of its faculty or who holds an appointment as a faculty member at another institution, and who will participate in the project being supported.

#### B. Other Personnel

- 1. A Postdoctoral Associate is an individual who received a Ph.D., M.D., D.Sc., or equivalent degree less than five years ago, who is not a member of the faculty of the performing institution, and who is not reported under Senior Personnel above.
- 2. Other Professional is a person who may or may not hold a doctoral degree or its equivalent, who is considered a professional and is not reported as a principal investigator or co-principal investigator, faculty associate, postdoctoral associate, or student. Examples of personnel included in this category are doctoral associates not reported under B1, professional technicians, mathematicians, physicians, veterinarians, systems experts, computer programmers, and design engineers.
- 3. A Graduate Student (research assistant) is a part-time or full-time student working on the project in a research capacity who holds at least a bachelor's degree or its equivalent and is enrolled in a degree program leading to an advanced degree.
- 4. An Undergraduate Student is a student who is enrolled in a degree program (part-time or full-time) leading to a bachelor's degree.
- 5, 6. These categories include persons working on the project in a non-research capacity, such as secretaries, clerk-typists, draftsmen, animal caretakers, electricians, and custodial personnel, regardless of whether they hold a degree or are involved in degree work.

PROPOSAL FORMS ARE AVAILABLE AT THE BOARD OFFICE OR AT <a href="http://www.idahoboardofed.org/herc/grants/rfp.asp">http://www.idahoboardofed.org/herc/grants/rfp.asp</a>.